

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 8-21, 25, 26, and 28-31 were previously pending in the application. In the present response, Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 13, 15, and 20 are amended.

### Drawings

The drawings are objected to for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action of August 18, 2009 alleges that the drawings fail to show "... potential image degradation... is localized on said one or more of the columns of first colored subpixels."

Applicant notes that the areas of localized degradation circled in FIG. 6, for example, include "columns of first colored subpixels," which in this particular example are the blue columns 108. FIG. 6, thus, already shows that "... potential image degradation... is localized on said one or more of the columns of first colored subpixels." No new drawing is necessary.

### Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-5, 8-14, 20, 21, 25, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Independent Claim 1 was rejected specifically because it states that "the driver circuit uses a substantially periodic dot inversion polarity scheme" and "said driver circuit selectively violates the dot inversion polarity scheme." Both of these phrases have been removed.

Independent Claim 8 was rejected for a reason similar to Claim 1. As the rejected phrases have been deleted, the rejection is overcome.

Similar changes have been made to independent Claims 13 and 20 whereby the rejected phrases have been removed.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 9-12, 14, 15, 21, 26, and 28 were rejected for depending on rejected base claims but these rejections are overcome by virtue of the amendments to independent Claims 1, 8, 13, and 20.

#### Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 13-16, 19-21, 25, 26, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,326,981 to Mori (“Mori”).

Independent Claims 1, 8, 13, and 20 are patentable over Mori because they recite that a subpixel repeating group has “an even number of individually addressable subpixels including a first colored subpixel, a second colored subpixel and a third colored subpixel, which have different colors from each other, in a row ....” Mori fails to teach a subpixel repeating group that has an even number of subpixels of three different colors. In fact, Mori teaches away from this configuration recited in the independent Claims by only showing “repeating groups” with two colors in a row. For Example, the Office Action specifically refers to Mori’s FIG. 15 as teaching a “repeating group” (see Office Action, page 2) but there are only two colors in each row even in FIG. 15.

For at least this reason, Claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 13-16, 19-21, 25, 26, and 28-31 are patentable.

Claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori as explained above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,714,206 to Martin (“Martin”). As Martin fails to cure Mori’s deficiency because it also fails to teach a repeating group with three colors in a row, these rejections are overcome.

Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori as explained above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,411 to Francis (“Francis”). As Francis fails to cure Mori’s deficiency, these rejections are overcome.

The amendments above are presented in the interest of expediting the prosecution of this case and does not indicate an acquiescence to any Official Notice or statement in the Office Action.

### Conclusion

In view of the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Authorization is given to charge any fees due or credit any overpayments in regard to this communication to deposit account 50-5029. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (408) 331-1672 is welcomed and encouraged.

#### Certification of Electronic Transmission

Certificate of Transmission: I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFSWeb electronic system on:

November 18, 2009

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate:

Kieun "Jenny" Sung

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Respectfully submitted,

/Kieun "Jenny" Sung/

Kieun "Jenny" Sung  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 48,639

#### **Innovation Counsel LLP**

21771 Stevens Creek Boulevard, Suite 200  
Cupertino, California 95014

Direct: (408) 331-1672

Telephone: (408) 331-1670

Facsimile: (408) 725-8263

E-mail: [jsung@innovationcounsel.com](mailto:jsung@innovationcounsel.com)